

REMARKS

Claim 46 is pending in the subject application.

Applicants have canceled claims 42-45 in favor of new claim 46. The changes to the claims made herein do not introduce any new matter.

Claim Objections

In the Final Office Action, the Examiner objected to claims 42 and 45 on the basis of informalities. In light of the cancellation of claims 42 and 45 herein, the objections to claims 42 and 45 are moot.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

In the Final Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 42 and 45 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Tamura et al.* (“*Tamura*”) (US 6,806,978 B1) in view of *Purcell et al.* (“*Purcell*”) (US 6,718,412 B2). The Examiner rejected claims 43 and 44 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Tamura* in view of *Purcell* and *Tanaka et al.* (“*Tanaka*”) (US 2001/0022624 A1). As noted above, Applicants have canceled claims 42-45. As such, the obviousness rejections of claims 42-45 are moot.

New Claim

As noted above, Applicants have added claim 46. Claim 46 was drafted based on the flowchart shown in Figure 4 of the subject application and former claim 42, which corresponds to an allowed claim in one of the Japanese applications from which the subject application claims priority. As such, claim 46 is supported by Applicants’ disclosure.

To the extent that the obviousness rejections based on combinations of the *Tamura*, *Purcell*, and *Tanaka* references might be considered applicable to claim 46, Applicants believe that the subject matter defined in claim 46 includes numerous features that are neither shown nor suggested in the *Tamura*, *Purcell*, and *Tanaka* references.

For example, the *Purcell* reference discloses an interrupt-in signal which is transmitted by controller 100. This interrupt-in signal is alleged to correspond to the claimed “Interrupt In” command. *Purcell* further discloses a status (see Figure 5), which is transmitted by the device 110 in response to the interrupt-in signal. In the claimed subject matter, both the “Interrupt In” command and the status of the print unit are transmitted from the print unit. In contrast, the interrupt-in signal and the status shown by *Purcell* are transmitted from separated devices, i.e., controller 100 and device 110. As such, the status disclosed in the *Purcell* reference does not constitute the status of a print unit as specified in claim 46.

Thus, in view of the foregoing, even if one having ordinary skill in the art were to combine the *Tamura*, *Purcell*, and *Tanaka* references in the manner proposed by the Examiner, the result of this combination would not have included each and every feature of the subject matter defined in claim 46.

Accordingly, claim 46 is believed to be patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over the *Tamura*, *Purcell*, and *Tanaka* references, whether considered alone or in any combination thereof.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request examination of claim 46, and submit that this claim is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, issuance of a notice of allowance is respectfully requested. In the event a telephone conversation would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner may reach the undersigned at **(408) 749-6902**.

U.S. Application No. 10/506,453
Amendment dated September 7, 2010
Response to Final Office Action dated June 7, 2010
(Submitted with RCE)

If any fees are due in connection with the filing of this paper, then the Commissioner is authorized to charge such fees to Deposit Account No. 50-0805 (Order No. NGBCP007).

Respectfully submitted,
MARTINE PENILLA & GENCARELLA, LLP

/Peter B. Martine/

Peter B. Martine
Registration No. 32,043

710 Lakeway Drive, Suite 200
Sunnyvale, California 94085
Customer No. 25920